

1
2
3
4 MITZIE PEREZ, ET AL.,
5
6

Plaintiffs,

7 v.
8

9 WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.,
10
11

Defendant.

Case No. 17-cv-00454-MMC

**ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S
MOTION TO STRIKE; AFFORDING
PLAINTIFFS LEAVE TO AMEND;
DEFERRING RULING ON MOTION
FOR RELIEF FROM DISCOVERY
ORDERS; GRANTING MOTION TO
STAY RELATED DISCOVERY
PENDING RESOLUTION OF MOTION
FOR RELIEF; VACATING HEARING**

12
13
14 Before the Court are three motions filed by defendant Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.:
15 (1) "Motion to Strike Portions of the Second Amended Complaint" ("Motion to Strike"),
16 filed November 22, 2017; (2) "Motion for Relief from the December 15, 2017 and
17 December 21, 2017 Discovery Orders of the Honorable Elizabeth D. Laporte Regarding
18 Scope of Discovery and Organizational Charts" ("Motion for Relief"), filed December 27,
19 2017; and (3) "Motion to Stay Related Discovery Pending Final Disposition of Wells
20 Fargo's Motion for Relief from the December 15, 2017 Discovery Order of the Honorable
21 Elizabeth D. Laporte" ("Motion to Stay"), filed December 27, 2017.¹ The Court, having
22 read and considered the papers filed in support of and in opposition to the motions,
23 deems the matters suitable for decision thereon, VACATES the hearing scheduled for
24 February 2, 2018, and rules as follows.

25 //
26
27

28 ¹The parties' respective administrative motions to seal specified exhibits, filed in
connection therewith, will be addressed by separate order.

1 For the reasons stated by defendant in the Motion to Strike, the Court finds the
2 proposed class definition set forth in the Second Amended Complaint is a fail-safe class.
3 (See Def.'s Mot. to Strike, filed November 22, 2017, at 4:8 - 6:11.) Accordingly, the
4 Motion to Strike is hereby GRANTED and plaintiffs' class allegations are hereby
5 STRICKEN.² Plaintiffs are hereby afforded leave to amend for purposes of redefining the
6 proposed class; any Third Amended Complaint shall be filed no later than February 16,
7 2018.

8 As plaintiffs have been given leave to amend to redefine the proposed class, the
9 Court finds it appropriate to defer ruling on the Motion for Relief, by which defendant
10 seeks an order vacating Magistrate Judge Laporte's order requiring defendant to provide
11 discovery as to matters relating solely to putative class members. Accordingly, the Court
12 hereby DEFERS ruling on the Motion for Relief until after plaintiffs have filed a Third
13 Amended Complaint and the Court has resolved any motion to strike the class allegations
14 alleged therein.

15 Lastly, defendant's Motion to Stay, by which defendant seeks an order staying the
16 above-referenced discovery pending resolution of the Motion for Relief, is hereby
17 GRANTED.

18 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

19
20 Dated: January 30, 2018

MAXINE M. CHESNEY
United States District Judge

21
22
23
24
25
26
27

²In light of the Court's order striking the class allegations, the Court does not
28 address herein defendant's additional argument that plaintiffs' individual claims are not
typical of those of the proposed class as presently alleged.